



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/556,068	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavarpu	5181-48400	6894
7590	06/18/2007			
Robert C Kowert Conley Rose and Tayon P C P O Box 398 Austin, TX 78767-0398			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/556,068	ALLAVARPU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to:
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 April 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-63 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments/remarks dated 4/2/07 with respect to claims regarding the 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph rejection including enablement requirement of the office action dated 10/5/2006, i.e., Just because a manager is coupled to a gateway that in turn is coupled to a managed object does not imply that the manager is automatically or inherently interfacing, or cannot be prevented from interfacing, with the managed object. According to the Examiner's logic, every PC connected (coupled) to the Internet is interfacing with every other PC concurrently connected (coupled) to the Internet. Similarly, following the Examiner's logic, since a firewall device coupled between a home PC and the Internet implies the firewall device would unable to prevent a malicious PC from interfacing with the home PC, is considered and the 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph rejections of the office action dated 10/5/2006 is withdrawn, and hence the rejections to the claims are presented (considering that the applicant's claim are enabling as per the remarks). Applicant's remark, However, the entire discussion is moot since the restriction requirement has been withdrawn, at page 21, is noted, and hence pages 20-22, line 8, is no longer discussed. All the claims 1-63 are subject to examination and rejection/objection is provided.

The office action dated 2/10/2005 of the prosecution history contains the following:

In order to speed up the prosecution of this case, examiner has made an additional serious effort for amending the independent claims. Applicant is suggested to make the following amendments to the claims to define the scope of their invention.

Cancellation of claims 58 – 63 and Amendment of claims 1, 20, 39 as follows:

Claim 1: A network management system, comprising:

a gateway coupled between a plurality of managed objects and a plurality of proxy agent managers; and the gateway is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to the managers and to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed objects; wherein, each of the events and each of the requests contain a user identification; wherein, the user identification identifies the respective manager for which the event or the request belongs to;

a platform-independent interface to the gateway, wherein the gateway is configurable to provide communication between the managers and the managed objects through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events and the requests; wherein, the managers share a singleton Request Service Access Point (RequestSAP) object;

wherein, the gateway is configurable to provide object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects to receive the events from and to send the requests to the managed objects, wherein said object-level access control is provided by the Request SAP object at an individual object level to grant one of the managers to access one of the managed objects while the Request SAP object preventing the one of the managers being accessed by the other managed objects.

Claims 20: and 39: Amendment of these claims with the similar limitations of the above-amended claim 1.

For clarification, after the office action dated 2/10/2005, as per the prosecution history, the proposed amendment of the office action dated 2/10/2005 (and all previously proposed amendments including informal and draft and incomplete proposals to the claims) is updated as following:

Claim 1: A network management system, comprising:

a gateway coupled between a plurality of managed objects and a plurality of proxy agent managers; and the gateway is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to the managers and to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed objects; each of

the events and each of the requests contain a user identification; the user identification identifies the respective manager for which the event or the request belongs;

a platform-independent interface to the gateway, wherein the gateway is configurable to provide communication between the managers and the managed objects through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events and the requests; the managers share a singleton Request Service Access Point (RequestSAP) of the gateway;

wherein, the gateway is configurable to provide object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects to receive the events from and to send the requests to the managed objects, wherein said object-level access control is provided by the Request Service Access Point at an individual object level to grant one of the managers to access one of the managed objects while the Request SAP prevents the one of the managers to access the other managed objects.

Claims 20: and 39: Amendment of the limitations with the similar limitations of the above-amended claim 1.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/12/2006, pages 17-52, and 4/2/2007, pages 22-31 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of the claims is maintained. Please refer to the responses to the arguments that were addressed in the office actions dated 10/5/2006.

4. Regarding the applicant's concern about the limitations "object-level access control at an individual object level", Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)*. The First inquiry must be into exactly what the claims define. See *In re Wilder, 166 USPQ 545, 548 (CCPA 1970)*. In fact the specification contains, "The Request Gateway may provide object-level access control between manager applications and managed objects in that manager application access to managed objects may be granted at the individual object level by use of a Request Service Access Point (RequestSAP). In this way user information may be included with each request sent to a managed object through the MIS. The MIS

may then use this (user) information to determine whether the user has access to that particular object. In one embodiment, the MIS may check the user ID against an authentication list or table which contains user/object access information. A regular application Service Access Point (SAP) does not allow the insertion of the user information in the request message to enforce object-level access control, and therefore a request SAP is recommended to send PMI requests and receive PMI responses with appropriate object-level access control enforced". Regarding, the statement, "the fact that Barry teaches a graphical user interface for enabling a user to interact with services provided by remote servers has absolutely no relevance to object-level access control", "the examiner's position is completely unsupported by the teachings of the cited art", concern regarding the combination of teachings, barksers teaches away from object-level access control, the examiner is incorrectly assuming, when reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. **In re Preda, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968)** and **In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963)**. Skill in the art is presumed. **In re Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985)**. Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose. **In re Jacoby, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962)**. The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. **In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969)**. Every reference relies to some extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein. **In re Bode, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977)**.

It is well established that a conclusion of obviousness may be made based on a combination of references based on a reason, suggestion or motivation to lead an inventor to combine those references. *In re Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastic Inc.*, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1629 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972). There is no requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300, 1302 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

Also, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of a primary reference. It is also not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 414, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981); *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 591, 18 USPQ2d 1089, 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Please refer to the below rejections for the claims. Regarding the applicant's concern that the limitations, object corresponding to a telephone network and providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object is not well known in the art, Reisman, 6,769,009, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, cols., 26-30. Reed, 6,757,710, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, col., 17 – 21. Arango et al., 6,724,747, discloses usage of these well-known

limitations, cols, 3 – 5. Kung et al., 7,120,139, discloses usage of these well-known limitations, cols., 4-6. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Response to Amendment

5. The amendment filed 4/2/07 is acknowledged.

Specification

6. The applicant's amendment to the title is acknowledged and hence the objection of the title of the office action dated 10/5/2006 is withdrawn.

7. The applicant's amendment to the abstract is acknowledged and hence the objection of the abstract of the office action dated 10/5/2006 is withdrawn.

Drawings

8. The applicant's replacement of the figure 4 is acknowledged and hence the objection of the figures of the office action dated 10/5/2006 is withdrawn.

Double Patenting

9. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55, 58-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of copending application, 09/552,984, as per the office action dated 10/5/2006. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55, 58-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-44 of U.S. Patent, 6839748, as per the office action dated 10/5/2006.

11. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55, 58-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent, 6813770, as per the office action dated 10/5/2006.

12. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55, 58-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent, 6915324, as per the office action dated 10/5/2006.

13. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55, 58-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent, 6950935, as per the office action dated 10/5/2006.

Note: The applicant's arguments regarding the double-patenting rejections are considered and hence the claims for the double patenting rejection are updated.

Claim Objections

14. Claims 20, 39, 59, 60, 62, 63 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 20, 39, 59, 60, 62, 63 mentions, "determining on", which should be --determining at--

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

15. Claims 1-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: Usage of EDS Source and EDS Sink of figures 4 and 3. The applicant's replacement of the figure 4, i.e., element 408 to support the claimed invention is acknowledged and hence one skilled in the art very well knows that element 408 of the figure 4 cannot be accomplished without the usage of EDS source and EDS Sink. Further usage of authentication module and the usage of module that prevent from interfacing is necessary as per the applicant cited paragraph of the page 28 of the remarks, in order to accomplish the invention.

16. Claims 58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps/elements/structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps/elements/necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps/elements/necessary structural connections are: Structural

connection and relationship between the gateway and the request service access point. The specification states, “The Request Gateway may provide object-level access control between manager applications and managed objects in that manager application access to managed objects may be granted at the individual object level by use of a Request Service Access Point (RequestSAP). In this way user information may be included with each request sent to a managed object through the MIS. The MIS may then use this (user) information to determine whether the user has access to that particular object. In one embodiment, the MIS may check the user ID against an authentication list or table which contains user/object access information. A regular application Service Access Point (SAP) does not allow the insertion of the user information in the request message to enforce object-level access control, and **therefore a request SAP is recommended to send PMI requests and receive PMI responses** with appropriate object-level access control enforced”. The claims not only fails to provide structural connection and relationship between the gateway and the request service access point, but also the required “user information included with each request” and determining using the user information, that is necessary for the request service access point (RequestSAP) to provide the object-level access control. The claimed requestSAP is no different than the regular application SAP without user information etc, please see the claims. As claims 1-57, the object-level access control in the claims 58-63 is claimed under “wherein the gateway is configurable to provide”.

17. Claims 1-63 recite the limitations, “gateway is configurable”. These limitations are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in the claim. It is not apparent whether the gateway is configured or not.

18. The term “different” in claims 1-63 is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. It is not apparent how one object is considered different than other object.

Note: Regarding the applicant's usage of "wherein" and/or "whereby" in the claimed subject matter of the claims, the claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure. Please see **Minton v. Nat'l Ass'n of Securities Dealers, Inc.**, **336 F.3d 1373, 1381, 67 USPQ2d 1614, 1620** (Fed. Cir. 2003)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 16-17, 20, 24-26, 28, 35-36, 39, 43-45, 47, 54-55, 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent et al. U.S. patent number 6,363,421, Lucent Technologies (Hereinafter Barker-Lucent) in view of Barry et al., 6,615,258 (Hereinafter Barry) and JIDM Interaction Translation, Initial Submission to OMG's CORBA/TMN Internetworking RFP, Edition, 4.0, February 1998, pages, i-v, 1-1 to 7-132, 9-167 to 9-169 (Hereinafter CORBA/TMN).

21. As per claims 1, 20, 39, 58-60, Barker-Lucent teaches the following:

a network management method / a carrier medium/ system comprising (e.g., col. 1, lines 27-30),

a gateway (e.g., an element management server, col.1, lines 27-30) which is coupled to a plurality of managed objects (e.g. col. 1, lines 29-36) and which is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to manager (e.g., col. 1, lines 63-65) or to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed object (e.g., col. 1, lines 63-65); and

a platform-independent interface to the gateway (e.g., col. 4, lines 37-55), wherein the gateway is configurable to communicate with the managers through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events or requests (e.g., col. 1, lines 63-65),

wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level control (e.g., usage of a naming service, etc., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63), between the managers (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19) and the managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19) to send the requests to the managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19),

sending an identity of a user of a manager application to a gateway (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63),

determine on a managed object level whether or not the manager application (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63) is allowed to receive an event generated by one of plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63) or to send a request to the one of the plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63) as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63), whereby access for the manager application to send the request is approved or denied for said managed object (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63).

delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63).

However, Barker-Lucent does not specifically mention about individual object level.

Barry discloses the well-known concept of usage at individual object level (e.g., access to individual objects based upon the customer privilege models, col., 15, lines 31 - 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent with the teachings of Barry in order to facilitate usage at individual object level because the concept of accessing individual object level would enhance supporting event / request by the object.

Barker-Lucent and Bowman do not specifically mention about access control so that one of the managers is granted access (e.g., usage of service access point, figure 7-8, page 7-119) to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., figure 6-9, section 6.2.4, page 6-105, figure 6-6, page 6-101, figure 7-5, section 7.1.5., page 7-115).

However, CORBA/TMN discloses well-known concept of access control (e.g., page 4 – 62) so that one of the managers is granted access (e.g., usage of service access point, figure 7-8, page 7-119) to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., figure 6-9, section 6.2.4, page 6-105, figure 6-6, page 6-101, figure 7-5, section 7.1.5., page 7-115) and the usage of a request Service Access Point (SAP) (e.g., e.g., figures 6-2, 7-8, section 6.1.2, page 6-97).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent and Barry with the teachings of

Art Unit: 2154

CORBA/TMN in order to facilitate access control so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects because the concept of accessing a single object would enhance supporting event / request for the particular object. The prevention of not accessing the other object when accessing the object would enhance supporting event / request specific to the object and not in common with the other object.

22. As per claims 5, 24 and 43, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the events or requests are delivered by the gateway through the platform-independent interface according to Internet Inter-Object Protocol (IIOP) (e.g., use of IIOP protocol, col. 9, lines 15-19).

23. As per claims 6-7, 25-26 and 44-45, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the platform-independent interface to the gateway is expressed in an interface definition language (e.g., use of interface description language (IDL), col. 39, lines 1-15, figure 15), and wherein the interface definition language comprises a language for defining interfaces to the managed objects across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (e.g., IDL is used to describe any resource or service a server component wants to expose to its clients without regard to its implementation language or operating system, col. 39, lines 1-15, figure 15),

the interface definition language comprises OMG IDL (e.g., use of object management group (OMG) IDL, col. 7, lines 1-30).

24. As per claims 9, 28 and 47, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the managed objects comprise an object corresponding to a telecommunications device (e.g., col., 2, line 49 – col., 3, line 40).

25. As per claims 16-17, 35-36 and 54-55, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the requests comprise a query for information concerning the managed object (e.g., col. 40, lines 27-38),

the requests comprise a command to set parameter of the managed object (e.g., col. 40, lines 27-38).

26. Claims 8, 27, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN in view of “Official Notice”.

27. As per claims 8, 27 and 46, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN do not specifically mention about object corresponding to a telephone network. “Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing object corresponding to a telephone network is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include object corresponding to a telephone network with the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN in order to facilitate usage of object corresponding to a telephone network because the object corresponding to a telephone network would support information related to the telephone network. The gateway would help utilize the information.

28. Claims 2-4, 10, 21-23, 29, 40-42, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN in view of Olden, 6,460,141, RSA Security Inc., (Hereinafter Olden-RSA-Security).
29. As per claims 2-4, 21-23 and 40-42, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the gateway is configurable to determine whether each of the managers can communicate with each of the managed objects, receive the events from the managed objects / managed object generating the event (e.g., col. 8, lines 31-54).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN do not specifically mention about authorization as a function of the identity of the managed object / user IDs entered by users of the managers.

Olden-RSA-Security discloses the well-known concept of authorization (e.g., abstract) as a function of the identity of the managed object (e.g., col., 9, lines 2 – 34) / user IDs entered by users of the managers (e.g., col., 25, lines 5 – col., 26, line 28, col., 7, lines 31 - 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN with the

Art Unit: 2154

teachings of Olden-RSA-Security in order to facilitate authorization as a function of the identity of the managed object / user IDs entered by users of the managers because the authorization would enhance verifying that the managed object is been accessed by the valid manager and not the unauthorized manager. The User IDs of the users and the identity of the managed object would help support providing authorization functionality.

30. As per claims 10, 29 and 48, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the gateway is configurable to provide audit trails (e.g., col., 17, line 27 – col., 18, line 67).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN do not specifically mention about security information.

Olden-RSA-Security discloses the well-known concept of usage of security information (e.g., abstract, e.g., col., 29, lines 1 - 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN with the teachings of Olden-RSA-Security in order to facilitate usage of security because the security information would enhance keeping track of the activities that occur with the information related to handled objects. The audit information would be available in future.

31. Claims 11-15, 30-34 and 49-53, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security in view of “Official Notice”.

Art Unit: 2154

32. As per claims 11-15, 30-34 and 49-53, Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barker-Lucent also teaches the gateway providing logging (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53), to log user information that sends each request (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53), to log information of the managed object that is the source of each event (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53), to log a time at which each event is generated / delivered (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col. 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53, col., 31, lines 15 – col., 43, col., 39, line 24 – col., 40, line 29, col., 23, line 55 – col., 24, line 10).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security do not specifically mention about providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object with the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security in order to facilitate usage of access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object because the accessing would enhance utilizing the logging service. The ID of the user and the object would help enhance logging information regarding the user and the object.

Art Unit: 2154

33. Claims 18, 37 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN in view of Hearne et al., 2001/0052113 (Hereinafter Hearne) in view of Solstice Enterprise Manager 4.1 Managing your network, Chapter 1, 08/16/1998, pages 1-27, SUN (Hereinafter SUN).

34. As per claims 18, 37 and 56, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barker-Lucent also teaches the requests are converted from one format to another format prior to delivery to the managed objects (e.g., usage of CORBA, IDL/IOP, etc., col., 21, line 46 – col., 22, line 59).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security do not specifically mention about conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format.

Hearne discloses the well-known concept of conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format (e.g., abstract, paragraph 58 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security with the teachings of Hearne in order to facilitate conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format because the conversion would enhance supporting information in a platform-specific format. The converted information from the interface definition language would support communication between two entities.

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN, Olden-RSA-Security and Hearne do not specifically mention about Portable Management Interface (PMI).

SUN discloses the well-known usage of Portable Management Interface (PMI) (e.g., figure 1-1, page 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN, Olden-RSA-Security and Hearne with the teachings of SUN in order to facilitate usage of well-known usage of Portable Management Interface (PMI) because the platform-specific format being PMI would enhance the managed object to utilize the format structure of PMI for communication with another entity. The object would benefit implementation of information using PMI format for sending event and/or receiving request.

35. Claims 19, 38 and 57, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN in view of Hearne et al., 2001/0052113 (Hereinafter Hearne).

36. As per claims 19, 38 and 57, Barker-Lucent, Barry and CORBA/TMN disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barker-Lucent also teaches the requests are converted from one format to another format prior to delivery to the managed objects (e.g., usage of CORBA, IDL/IOP, etc., col., 21, line 46 – col., 22, line 59).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security do not specifically mention about conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format.

Hearne discloses the well-known concept of conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format (e.g., abstract, paragraph 58 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN and Olden-RSA-Security with the teachings of Hearne in order to facilitate conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format because the conversion would enhance supporting information in a platform-specific format. The converted information from the interface definition language would support communication between two entities.

37. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 16-17, 20, 24-26, 28, 35-36, 39, 43-45, 47, 54-55, 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent in view of Barry et al., 6,615,258 (Hereinafter Barry) and Buckle et al., (Hereinafter Buckle).

38. As per claims 1, 20, 39, 58-60, Barker-Lucent teaches the following:

a network management method / a carrier medium/ system comprising (e.g., col. 1, lines 27-30),
a gateway (e.g., an element management server, col.1, lines 27-30) which is coupled to a plurality of managed objects (e.g. col. 1, lines 29-36) and which is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to manager (e.g., col. 1, lines 63-65) or to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed object (e.g., col. 1, lines 63-65); and

Art Unit: 2154

a platform-independent interface to the gateway (e.g., col. 4, lines 37-55), wherein the gateway is configurable to communicate with the managers through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events or requests (e.g., col. 1, lines 63-65),

wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level control (e.g., usage of a naming service, etc., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63), between the managers (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19) and the managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19) to send the requests to the managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19),

sending an identity of a user of a manager application to a gateway (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63),

determine on a managed object level whether or not the manager application (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63) is allowed to receive an event generated by one of plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63) or to send a request to the one of the plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63) as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63), whereby access for the manager application to send the request is approved or denied for said managed object (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63).

delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved (e.g., col., 8, line 53 – col., 9, line 19, col., 7, lines 47 – 63).

However, Barker-Lucent does not specifically mention about individual object level and SAP.

Barry discloses the well-known concept of usage at individual object level and the usage of request SAP (e.g., access to individual objects based upon the customer privilege models, col., 15, lines 31 - 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent with the teachings of Barry in order to facilitate usage at individual object level because the concept of accessing individual object level would enhance supporting event / request by the object.

Barker-Lucent and Bowman do not specifically mention about access control so that one of the managers is granted access (e.g., usage of service access point, figure 7-8, page 7-119) to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., figure 6-9, section 6.2.4, page 6-105, figure 6-6, page 6-101, figure 7-5, section 7.1.5., page 7-115).

However, Buckle discloses well-known concept of access control so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., figures 2-10, 12-15, col., 3, lines 46 – col., 4, line 41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent and Barry with the teachings of Buckle in order to facilitate access control so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects because the concept of accessing a single object would enhance supporting event / request for the particular object. The prevention of not accessing the other object when

accessing the object would enhance supporting event / request specific to the object and not in common with the other object.

39. As per claims 5, 24 and 43, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the events or requests are delivered by the gateway through the platform-independent interface according to Internet Inter-Object Protocol (IIOP) (e.g., use of IIOP protocol, col. 9, lines 15-19).

40. As per claims 6-7, 25-26 and 44-45, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the platform-independent interface to the gateway is expressed in an interface definition language (e.g., use of interface description language (IDL), col. 39, lines 1-15, figure 15), and wherein the interface definition language comprises a language for defining interfaces to the managed objects across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (e.g., IDL is used to describe any resource or service a server component wants to expose to its clients without regard to its implementation language or operating system, col. 39, lines 1-15, figure 15),

the interface definition language comprises OMG IDL (e.g., use of object management group (OMG) IDL, col. 7, lines 1-30).

41. As per claims 9, 28 and 47, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the managed objects comprise an object corresponding to a telecommunications device (e.g., col., 2, line 49 – col., 3, line 40).

42. As per claims 16-17, 35-36 and 54-55, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the following:

the requests comprise a query for information concerning the managed object (e.g., col. 40, lines 27-38),

the requests comprise a command to set parameter of the managed object (e.g., col. 40, lines 27-38).

43. Claims 8, 27, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle in view of “Official Notice”.

44. As per claims 8, 27 and 46, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. However, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle do not specifically mention about object corresponding to a telephone network. “Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing object corresponding to a telephone network is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include object corresponding to a telephone network with the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle in order to facilitate usage of object corresponding to a telephone

network because the object corresponding to a telephone network would support information related to the telephone network. The gateway would help utilize the information.

45. Claims 2-4, 10, 21-23, 29, 40-42, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle in view of Olden, 6,460,141, RSA Security Inc., (Hereinafter Olden-RSA-Security).

46. As per claims 2-4, 21-23 and 40-42, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the gateway is configurable to determine whether each of the managers can communicate with each of the managed objects, receive the events from the managed objects / managed object generating the event (e.g., col. 8, lines 31-54).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle do not specifically mention about authorization as a function of the identity of the managed object / user IDs entered by users of the managers.

Olden-RSA-Security discloses the well-known concept of authorization (e.g., abstract) as a function of the identity of the managed object (e.g., col., 9, lines 2 – 34) / user IDs entered by users of the managers (e.g., col., 25, lines 5 – col., 26, line 28, col., 7, lines 31 - 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle with the teachings of Olden-RSA-Security in order to facilitate authorization as a function of the identity of the managed object / user IDs entered by users of the managers because the authorization would enhance verifying that the managed object is been accessed by the valid manager and not the

unauthorized manager. The User IDs of the users and the identity of the managed object would help support providing authorization functionality.

47. As per claims 10, 29 and 48, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above. Barker-Lucent also teaches the gateway is configurable to provide audit trails (e.g., col., 17, line 27 – col., 18, line 67).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle do not specifically mention about security information.

Olden-RSA-Security discloses the well-known concept of usage of security information (e.g., abstract, e.g., col., 29, lines 1 - 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle with the teachings of Olden-RSA-Security in order to facilitate usage of security because the security information would enhance keeping track of the activities that occur with the information related to handled objects. The audit information would be available in future.

48. Claims 11-15, 30-34 and 49-53, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security in view of “Official Notice”.

49. As per claims 11-15, 30-34 and 49-53, Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Art Unit: 2154

Barker-Lucent also teaches the gateway providing logging (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53), to log user information that sends each request (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53), to log information of the managed object that is the source of each event (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col., 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53), to log a time at which each event is generated / delivered (e.g., col., 11, lines 18 – 60, col. 17, line 33 – col., 18, line 9, col., 41, line 63 – col., 42, line 53, col., 31, lines 15 – col., 43, col., 39, line 24 – col., 40, line 29, col., 23, line 55 – col., 24, line 10).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security do not specifically mention about providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object.

“Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object is well known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include providing access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object with the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security in order to facilitate usage of access to a logging service, to log an ID of a user, to log an ID of the object because the accessing would enhance utilizing the logging service. The ID of the user and the object would help enhance logging information regarding the user and the object.

Art Unit: 2154

50. Claims 18, 37 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle in view of Hearne et al., 2001/0052113 (Hereinafter Hearne) in view of Solstice Enterprise Manager 4.1 Managing your network, Chapter 1, 08/16/1998, pages 1-27, SUN (Hereinafter SUN).

51. As per claims 18, 37 and 56, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barker-Lucent also teaches the requests are converted from one format to another format prior to delivery to the managed objects (e.g., usage of CORBA, IDL/IOP, etc., col., 21, line 46 – col., 22, line 59).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security do not specifically mention about conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format.

Hearne discloses the well-known concept of conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format (e.g., abstract, paragraph 58 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security with the teachings of Hearne in order to facilitate conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format because the conversion would enhance supporting information in a platform-specific format. The converted information from the interface definition language would support communication between two entities.

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN, Olden-RSA-Security and Hearne do not specifically mention about Portable Management Interface (PMI).

SUN discloses the well-known usage of Portable Management Interface (PMI) (e.g., figure 1-1, page 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, CORBA/TMN, Olden-RSA-Security and Hearne with the teachings of SUN in order to facilitate usage of well-known usage of Portable Management Interface (PMI) because the platform-specific format being PMI would enhance the managed object to utilize the format structure of PMI for communication with another entity. The object would benefit implementation of information using PMI format for sending event and/or receiving request.

52. Claims 19, 38 and 57, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle in view of Hearne et al., 2001/0052113 (Hereinafter Hearne).

53. As per claims 19, 38 and 57, Barker-Lucent, Barry and Buckle disclose the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Barker-Lucent also teaches the requests are converted from one format to another format prior to delivery to the managed objects (e.g., usage of CORBA, IDL/IOP, etc., col., 21, line 46 – col., 22, line 59).

However, Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security do not specifically mention about conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format.

Hearne discloses the well-known concept of conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format (e.g., abstract, paragraph 58 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Barker-Lucent, Barry, Buckle and Olden-RSA-Security with the teachings of Hearne in order to facilitate conversion from the interface definition language to a platform-specific format because the conversion would enhance supporting information in a platform-specific format. The converted information from the interface definition language would support communication between two entities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

54. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55, 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vuong et al. U.S. patent number 6,430,578 (Hereinafter Vuong).

55. As per claims 1, 20, 39, 58-60, Vuong teaches the following:

a network management method / a carrier medium/ system comprising (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23),

a gateway which is coupled to a plurality of managed objects and which is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to manager (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line

23), or to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed object (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), and

a platform-independent interface to the gateway (e.g., col., 2, lines 1 – 26), wherein the gateway is configurable to communicate with the managers through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events or requests (e.g., col., 4, lines 40 – 67);

wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 - 59), between the managers and the managed objects to send the requests to the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 - 59),

sending an identity of a user of a manager application to a gateway (e.g., col., 5, lines 4 – 27),

determine on a managed object level whether or not the manager application (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), is allowed to receive an event generated by one of plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), or to send a request to the one of the plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application (e.g., col., 8, lines 21 – 42); whereby access for the manager application to send the request is approved or denied for said managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26) and the usage of request SAP (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26),

delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26),

individual object level and access control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 - 59); so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being

prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59).

56. As per claims 2-4, 21-23 and 40-42, Vuong also teaches the following:

the gateway is configurable to determine whether each of the managers can communicate with each of the managed objects, receive the events from the managed objects / managed object generating the event (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59),

authorization as a function of the identity of the managed object / user Ids entered by users of the managers (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59).

57. As per claims 5, 24 and 43, Vuong also teaches the following:

the events or requests are delivered by the gateway through the platform-independent interface according to Internet Inter-Object Protocol (IIOP) (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59).

58. As per claims 6, 25 and 44, Vuong also teaches the following:

the platform-independent interface to the gateway is expressed in an interface definition language (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42); and wherein the interface definition language comprises a language for defining interfaces to the managed objects across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

59. As per claims 8, 27, 46, Vuong also teaches the following:

object corresponding to a telephone network (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

60. As per claims 9, 28 and 47, Vuong also teaches the following:

the managed objects comprise an object corresponding to a telecommunications device (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

61. As per claims 10, 29 and 48, Vuong also teaches the following:

the gateway is configurable to provide audit trails and security information (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

62. As per claims 11, 30 and 49, Vuong also teaches the following:

the gateway providing access to a logging service (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

63. As per claims 16-17, 35-36 and 54-55, Vuong also teaches the following:

the requests comprise a query for information concerning the managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42),

the requests comprise a command to set parameter of the managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

64. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 16, 17, 20-25, 27-30, 35, 36, 39-44, 46-49, 54, 55 and 58-60, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Spencer U.S. patent number 6,253,243 (Hereinafter Spencer).

65. As per claims 1, 20, 39, 58-60, Spencer teaches the following:

a network management method / a carrier medium/ system comprising (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23),

a gateway which is coupled to a plurality of managed objects and which is configured to deliver events generated by the managed objects to manager (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), or to deliver requests generated by the managers to the managed object (e.g., col., 5, lines 57 – col., 6, line 23), and

a platform-independent interface to the gateway (e.g., col., 2, lines 1 – 26), wherein the gateway is configurable to communicate with the managers through the platform-independent interface to deliver the events or requests (e.g., col., 4, lines 40 – 67);

wherein the gateway is configurable to provide object-level control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 - 59), between the managers and the managed objects to send the requests to the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col., 6, lines 42 - 59),

sending an identity of a user of a manager application to a gateway (e.g., col., 5, lines 4 – 27),

determine on a managed object level whether or not the manager application (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), is allowed to receive an event generated by one of plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), or to send a request to the one of the plurality of managed objects (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32), as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application

(e.g., col., 8, lines 21 – 42); whereby access for the manager application to send the request is approved or denied for said managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26), and the usage of request SAP (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26),

delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved (e.g., col., 7, lines 2 – 26),

individual object level and access control (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59), so that one of the managers is granted access to one of the managed objects while being prevented from interfacing with a different one of the managed objects (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59).

66. As per claims 2-4, 21-23 and 40-42, Spencer also teaches the following:

the gateway is configurable to determine whether each of the managers can communicate with each of the managed objects, receive the events from the managed objects / managed object generating the event (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59),

authorization as a function of the identity of the managed object / user Ids entered by users of the managers (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59).

67. As per claims 5, 24 and 43, Spencer also teaches the following:

the events or requests are delivered by the gateway through the platform-independent interface according to Internet Inter-Object Protocol (IIOP) (e.g., col., 2, line 26 – 52, col.,6, lines 42 - 59).

68. As per claims 6, 25 and 44, Spencer also teaches the following:

the platform-independent interface to the gateway is expressed in an interface definition language (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42); and wherein the interface definition language comprises a language for defining interfaces to the managed objects across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

69. As per claims 8, 27, 46, Spencer also teaches the following:

object corresponding to a telephone network (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

70. As per claims 9, 28 and 47, Spencer also teaches the following:

the managed objects comprise an object corresponding to a telecommunications device (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

71. As per claims 10, 29 and 48, Spencer also teaches the following:

the gateway is configurable to provide audit trails and security information (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

72. As per claims 11, 30 and 49, Spencer also teaches the following:

the gateway providing access to a logging service (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

73. As per claims 16-17, 35-36 and 54-55, Spencer also teaches the following:
- the requests comprise a query for information concerning the managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42),
- the requests comprise a command to set parameter of the managed object (e.g., col., 7, lines 9 – 32, col., 8, lines 21 – 42).

Allowable Subject Matter

74. Claims 61-63 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

Haresh Patel

May 10, 2007